arXiv:hep-ph/0601003v3 21 Feb 2008

TUM-HEP-617/06
KEK-TH-1063

New contribution to dimension five operators on proton decay in anomaly mediation scenario

Naoyuki Haba[(a), 1] and Nobuchika Okada[(b), 2]

[(a)] *Physik-Department, Technishe Universität München, James-Franck Strasse, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

[(b)] *Theory Division, KEK, Tsukuba 305-0801, Japan*

[(c)] *Department of Particle and Nuclear Physics, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (Sokendai), Oho 1-1, Tsukuba 305-0801, Japan.*

Abstract

In supergravity, effective superpotential relevant to dimension five operators on proton decay processes also leads to supersymmetry breaking terms among sfermions, dimension four operators. These dimension four operators induce the dimension five operators through 1-loop diagrams dressed by gauginos. We find that, in a class of models with the anomaly mediation, the 1-loop contributions can be comparable to those at the tree level. Therefore, such operators have a great impact on proton decay rate. Depending on a universal phase of gaugino masses and soft mass spectrum, the proton decay rate can be enhanced or suppressed.

[1]E-mail: haba@ph.tum.de
[2]E-mail: okadan@post.kek.jp

Supersymmetry (SUSY) extension is one of the most promising ways to provide a solution to the gauge hierarchy problem in the Standard Model [1]. The minimal version of SUSY extension of the Standard Model is so-called the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM). Interestingly, the experimental data support the unification of the three gauge couplings in the MSSM at the scale $M_{GUT} \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$GeV [2]. At high energies, our world may be described by a SUSY grand unified theory (GUT) with a simple gauge group such as $SU(5)$, $SO(10)$, E_6 etc. into which all the gauge groups in the standard model are embedded and unified.

The most characteristic prediction of the (SUSY) GUTs is the proton decay. Normally in SUSY GUTs the proton decay process through the dimension five operators [3] involving MSSM matters and the color triplet Higgsino turns out to be the dominant decay modes, since the process is suppressed by only a power of the color triplet Higgsino mass scale. Experimental lower bound on the proton decay modes $p \to K^+\overline{\nu}$ through the dimension five operators is given by SuperKamiokande [4],

$$\tau(p \to K^+\overline{\nu}) \geq 2.2 \times 10^{33} \text{ [years]}.$$

This is one of the most stringent constraints on SUSY GUT models. In fact, it is widely believed that the minimal SUSY $SU(5)$ model is excluded from the experimental bound together with the requirement of the success of the three gauge coupling unification [5] [6].

However, for the proton decay processes through the dimension five operators, knowledge of the flavor structure is essential in order to give definite predictions for proton decay rate. Some models in which flavor structures are extended have been found to be consistent with the experiments [7] [8]. Also, if a GUT model has an extended structure for the Higgs sector, the proton decay rate depends on free parameters in the extended Higgs sector and, together with flavor structures, some model can avoid the stringent bound on the proton life time [9]. Although rapid proton decay would be avoidable in such ways, we need very complicated studies. It must be interesting if there exists new contribution to proton decay processes which can reduce proton decay rate without involving such complicated structures.

In this letter, we show that there exists such a new contribution to proton decay processes through dimension five operators, when SUSY breaking mediation obeys the anomaly mediated SUSY breaking (AMSB) scenario [10] [11]. In a class of models with the AMSB, SUSY breaking order parameter for superpartners in the MSSM is the mass of gravitino, more correctly, F-term of the compensating multiplet in superconformal framework of supergravity [12] [13] [3]. Then, the scale of the gravitino mass is roughly two orders of magnitude larger than that of soft SUSY breaking masses induced by the AMSB.

In supergravity, any dimensionful parameter in a model is always accompanied by the compensating multiplet, so that, once SUSY is broken, a SUSY breaking term proportional to the gravitino mass appears. A simple example is the B-term for the Higgs doublets in the MSSM. If we introduce μ-term in Higgs superpotential, we obtain $B \sim \mu m_{3/2}$ [4] after SUSY breaking, where $m_{3/2}$ is the gravitino mass. The similar thing happens even to higher

[3] This fact is crucial in some SUSY breaking models. Although the F-term of the compensating multiplet is of the same order of the gravitino mass in a simple SUSY breaking scenario, it is not a general consequence in supergravity. Gravitino can, in general, be super heavy, leaving the AMSB contribution to the soft SUSY mass spectrum in the MSSM around the electroweak scale [14].

[4] In AMSB scenario, this B-term is too big, because of the large gravitino mass. Thus, we need a

dimensional operators. This fact can be easily understood in the following way. Imagine that a higher dimensional operator is the result after integrating out some heavy fields. Thus, soft SUSY breaking term for the higher dimensional operator is originating from B-terms for the heavy fields integrated out. We examine such soft SUSY breaking terms originating from superpotentials which leads to the dimension five operators relevant to the proton decay. We will show that such terms have a great impact on the resultant proton decay rate.

For simplicity, we work on the minimal SUSY $SU(5)$ model. Application to other GUT models is straightforward. In the minimal SUSY $SU(5)$ model, effective superpotential obtained after integrating out color triplet Higgs superfields is given by [16]

$$W_{eff} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_C}} Y_{ikl} \left(Q_i Q_i\right) \left(Q_k L_l\right) + \frac{1}{M_{H_C}} Y_{ijkl} \left(u_i^c e_j^c\right) \left(u_k^c d_l^c\right), \tag{1}$$

where M_{H_C} is a supersymmetric mass of the color triplet Higgs superfields, which should be around the GUT scale, and Y_{ikl} and Y_{ijkl} are some products of Yukawa couplings (we do not need their explicit forms in the following discussion). Here, the contraction of the indices are understood as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(Q_i Q_i\right) \left(Q_k L_l\right) &= \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \left(u_i^\alpha d_i'^\beta - d_i'^\alpha u_i^\beta\right) \left(u_k^\gamma e_l - d_k'^\gamma \nu_l\right), \\ \left(u_i^c e_j^c\right) \left(u_k^c d_l^c\right) &= \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} u_{i\alpha}^c e_j^c u_{k\beta}^c d_{l\gamma}^c, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where α, β, γ are color indices and d_i' is defined as $d_i' = V_{ij} d_j$ with V_{ij} being the Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix. Extracting two fermions and two sfermions from the effective Lagrangian, we obtain dimension five operators relevant to proton decay.

Now let us see SUSY breaking effects on the effective superpotential. It is useful to work out in the superconformal framework of supergravity [13]. In this framework, SUSY breaking is encoded in F-component of the compensating multiplet $\phi = 1 + \theta^2 F_\phi$. Normal SUSY breaking models lead to $F_\phi \sim m_{3/2}$ due to the condition for vanishing cosmological constant (vacuum energy). In the original basis in the superconformal framework, the basic Lagrangian for matter and Higgs chiral superfields is symbolically written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d^4\theta \phi^\dagger \phi \mathcal{K} + \left(\int d^2\theta \phi^3 W + h.c. \right), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ and W are Kahler potential and superpotential, respectively. Assuming canonical Kahler potentials and rescaling all chiral superfields such as $X_i \to X_i/\phi$, we can eliminate the compensating multiplet from the above Kahler potential. The effective superpotential we are considering is the higher dimensional one and there exists the mass parameter M_{H_C}. Therefore, the compensating multiplet is left un-eliminated in the superpotential. Resultant effective superpotential is found to be

$$\int d^2\theta \frac{1}{2\phi M_{H_C}} Y_{ikl} \left(Q_i Q_i\right) \left(Q_k L_l\right) + \frac{1}{\phi M_{H_C}} Y_{ijkl} \left(u_i^c e_j^c\right) \left(u_k^c d_l^c\right). \tag{4}$$

fine-tuning to obtain the correct scale of the electroweak symmetry breaking. For an idea to reduce the B-term, see, for example, Ref. [15].

Substituting $\phi = 1 + \theta^2 F_\phi$, this superpotential leads to soft SUSY breaking terms among sfermions,

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft} \supset -\frac{F_\phi}{2M_{H_C}} Y_{ikl} \left(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_i\right) \left(\tilde{Q}_k \tilde{L}_l\right) - \frac{F_\phi}{M_{H_C}} Y_{ijkl} \left(\tilde{u^c}_i \tilde{e^c}_j\right) \left(\tilde{u^c}_k \tilde{d^c}_l\right) + h.c.. \tag{5}$$

These are dimension four operators.

In the above calculations, we used the effective superpotential obtained by integrating out the color triplet Higgs superfields under SUSY vacuum conditions and plugged it into the superconformal framework. Of course, we can do the same calculations by using the original superpotential before integrating the color triplets out. In the original Lagrangian, we obtain soft SUSY breaking term, B-term, for the color triplet Higgs bosons such as $F_\phi M_{H_C}$. After integrating out the color triplet Higgs bosons and Higgsinos, we come to the same result as the above. However, correctly speaking, there exist higher order terms with respect to the expansion parameter, (F_ϕ/M_{H_C}), in actual calculations. The result in Eq. (5) gives the correct leading term. Through the calculations based on the original Lagrangian, we can see that the dimension four operators originate from the B-term of the color triplet Higgs bosons.

Note that the soft SUSY breaking terms with dimension four lead to dimension five operators through 1-loop diagram dressed by gauginos.[5] These dimension five operators have the same coefficients, Y_{ijk} and Y_{ijkl}, as the ones obtained from Eq. (1), because the dimension four operators originate the same effective superpotential. Here, as an example, let us evaluate a dimension five operator $(\psi_{Q_i}\psi_{Q_i})(\tilde{Q}_k \tilde{L}_l)$ induced by the dimension four operator in Eq. (5) through 1-loop diagram dressed by gauginos. Calculations for other 1-loop diagrams are straightforward. For 1-loop diagram dressed by gluino, we obtain

$$\frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{\alpha_3}{4\pi}\right)\left(\frac{F_\phi}{2M_{H_C}}\right) M_3^* \times f(M_3, m_{\tilde{u}_i}, m_{\tilde{d}_i}), \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(M_3, m_{\tilde{u}_i}, m_{\tilde{d}_i}) &= \int_0^\infty \frac{k_E^2 dk_E^2}{\left(k_E^2 + |M_3|^2\right)\left(k_E^2 + m_{\tilde{u}_i}^2\right)\left(k_E^2 + m_{\tilde{d}_i}^2\right)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(m_{\tilde{u}_i}^2 - m_{\tilde{d}_i}^2)}\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{u}_i}^2}{m_{\tilde{u}_i}^2 - |M_3|^2}\ln\frac{m_{\tilde{u}_i}^2}{|M_3|^2} - \frac{m_{\tilde{d}_i}^2}{m_{\tilde{d}_i}^2 - |M_3|^2}\ln\frac{m_{\tilde{d}_i}^2}{|M_3|^2}\right), \\ &\sim \frac{1}{(|M_3|^2 - \tilde{m}^2)^2}\left(\tilde{m}^2 - |M_3|^2 - |M_3|^2 \ln\frac{\tilde{m}^2}{|M_3|^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where α_3 is the QCD gauge coupling (from fermion-sfermion-gaugino vertex), M_3 is generally complex gluino mass, and m_i denotes a mass squared of squark running in a loop. We took the degenerate mass spectrum for $m_{\tilde{u}_i} \sim m_{\tilde{d}_i} \equiv \tilde{m}$ in the last line. The loop function f is positive and its approximation form in some limits is given by

$$f(M_3, \tilde{m}) \sim \frac{1}{\tilde{m}^2} \quad (\text{for } |M_3| \ll \tilde{m}), \tag{8}$$

$$\sim \frac{1}{|M_3|^2}\left(\ln\frac{|M_3|^2}{\tilde{m}^2} - 1\right) \quad (\text{for } |M_3| \gg \tilde{m}). \tag{9}$$

[5] In the context of usual gravity mediated SUSY breaking in supergravity, 1-loop diagrams similar to those we consider in this paper were examined many years ago [17]. We would like to thank Pavel Fileviez Perez for leading our attention to the paper. In the usual case, contribution from the 1-loop diagrams is subdominant, because the gravitino mass is around the weak scale.

We obtain similar results for 1-loop corrections dressed by wino and bino. In the limit of absence of mixing with Higgsinos, 1-loop corrections dressed by wino and bino are found to be

$$\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{\alpha_2}{4\pi}\right)\left(\frac{F_\phi}{2M_{H_C}}\right)M_2^* \quad \times \quad f(M_2, m_{\tilde{u}_i}, m_{\tilde{d}_i}), \tag{10}$$

$$-2\frac{3}{5}Y_{Q_i}^2\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{4\pi}\right)\left(\frac{F_\phi}{2M_{H_C}}\right)M_1^* \quad \times \quad f(M_1, m_{\tilde{u}_i}, m_{\tilde{d}_i}), \tag{11}$$

respectively. Here, $Y_{Q_i} = 1/6$ is a hyper charge for the superfield Q_i.

Now, putting all corrections together, the dimension five operator is described as

$$\mathcal{L}_{d=5} = \frac{x}{2M_{H_C}} Y_{ikl}(\psi_{Q_i}\psi_{Q_i})(\tilde{Q}_k\tilde{L}_l), \tag{12}$$

where the factor x is given by

$$x = 1 + \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{\alpha_3}{4\pi}\right)F_\phi M_3^* f_3 + \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{\alpha_2}{4\pi}\right)F_\phi M_2^* f_2 - \frac{1}{30}\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{4\pi}\right)F_\phi M_1^* f_1. \tag{13}$$

Here, $f_j = f(M_j, m_{\tilde{u}_i}, m_{\tilde{d}_i})$. In usual soft SUSY breaking mass spectrum, soft masses for gauginos and sfermions are of the same order, and the loop function is characterized by the scale of soft SUSY breaking masses, $f_j \sim 1/M_{SUSY}$. Thus, we find

$$x \sim 1 + \frac{1}{M_{SUSY}}\sum_i e^{-i\varphi_i}\frac{\alpha_i}{4\pi}F_\phi, \tag{14}$$

where φ_i is a phase of each gaugino mass, $M_i = |M_i|e^{i\varphi_i}$. Non-zero relative phases among gaugino masses cause CP violation, and they are severely constrained by current experiments on electric dipole moments [18]. Thus, in the following, we assume the universal phase, $\varphi = \varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \varphi_3$, for all gaugino masses.

As mentioned above, we consider the AMSB scenario, where gauginos and sfermions obtain soft SUSY breaking masses through superconformal anomaly such as [10] [11]

$$M_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{4\pi}b_i F_\phi, \tag{15}$$

$$\tilde{m}_i^2 = 2c_i\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{4\pi}\right)^2 b_i|F_\phi|^2, \tag{16}$$

respectively, where α_i is the gauge coupling, b_i is a beta function coefficient, and c_i is a quadratic Casimir for each gauge interaction. Theses formulas imply that $\frac{\alpha_i}{4\pi}F_\phi \sim M_{SUSY}$ in Eq. (14) and, therefore, the dimension five operators induced by 1-loop corrections can be comparable to those at the tree level. This is a new contribution for proton decay processes we found. Note that the phase $e^{i\varphi}$ has an important role, so that proton decay rate can be enhanced or suppressed according to its value.

If we assume the pure AMSB scenario, soft SUSY breaking mass spectrum is fixed and we obtain definite results for the 1-loop induced dimension five operators. Especially, in this case, the phase $e^{-i\varphi}$ is canceled by the phase of F_ϕ and the sign of the new contribution is fixed by the sign of the beta function coefficients. However, note that, unfortunately, the

pure AMSB scenario is obviously excluded, because it predicts slepton squared masses being negative, the so-called "tachyonic slepton" problem. There have been many attempts to solve this problem by extending the pure AMSB model and taking into account additional positive contributions to slepton squared masses at tree level [10] [19] [20] or at quantum level [15] [21]. Usually, these extended models still keep F_ϕ as an order parameter of SUSY breaking and soft masses are characterized by $M_{SUSY} \sim 0.01 F_\phi$ with 1-loop suppression factor 0.01. We call these a class of models with AMSB. For these models, the phase of gaugino mass is, in general, not necessary to be the same as the one of F_ϕ and their relative phase can remain as a physical phase in Eq. (14). Therefore, there is a possibility that the dimension five operators induced by 1-loop corrections cancel those at the tree level if we can choose an appropriate relative phase and a soft mass spectrum.

In conclusion, we have considered the effective superpotential which leads to dimension five operators relevant to the proton decay. In supergravity, the effective superpotential also leads to soft SUSY breaking terms among sfermions, dimension four operators. These terms originate from the B-term of color triplet Higgs bosons. The dimension four operators can induce the dimension five operators through 1-loop diagrams dressed by gauginos. In a class of models with AMSB, the 1-loop contributions are found to be comparable to the dimension five operators at the tree level, because the gravitino mass is two orders of magnitude larger than the typical scale of soft SUSY breaking masses. Therefore, the proton decay rate can be enhanced or suppressed, depending on the universal phase of the gaugino masses and soft mass spectrum.

We have discussed on the dimension five operators induced by 1-loop corrections, which can be comparable to those at the tree level. Our discussion is applicable to other effective superpotentials appearing in some particle physics models. An example is an effective superpotential which provides a light Majorana mass for neutrino through the see-saw mechanism [22],

$$W_{eff} = \frac{(LH)(LH)}{M_R}, \tag{17}$$

where M_R is the scale of right-handed Majorana neutrino mass. In the same manner as the above, the superpotential leads to soft SUSY breaking term,

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft} = -\frac{F_\phi}{M_R}(\tilde{L}H)(\tilde{L}H). \tag{18}$$

Again, 1-loop corrections dressed by wino and bino can be comparable to the tree level one and resultant Majorana mass is altered from the one at the tree level. If a phase of gaugino masses is different from that of F_ϕ, the phase additionally contributes to the Majorana phase in the neutrino mixing matrix.

Acknowledgments

N.H. is supported by Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, and would like to thank M. Lindner for fruitful discussions. This work is supported in part by Scientific Grants from the Ministry of Education and Science in Japan (Grant Nos. 15740164, 16028214, and 16540258).

References

[1] See, for example, H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. **110**, 1 (1984), and references therein.

[2] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim and U. W. Lee, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **6**, 1745 (1991); P. Langacker and M. x. Luo, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 817 (1991); U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 447 (1991).

[3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 287 (1982); N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B197**, 533 (1982).

[4] M. Shiozawa, talk at the 4th workshop on "Neutrino Oscillations and their Origin" (NOON 2003), http://www-sk.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/noon2003/.

[5] T. Goto and T. Nihei, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 115009 (1999), hep-ph/9808255.

[6] H. Murayama and A. Pierce, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 055009 (2002), hep-ph/0108104.

[7] B. Bajc, P. Fileviez Perez and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 075005 (2002), hep-ph/0204311.

[8] D. Emmanuel-Costa and S. Wiesenfeldt, Nucl. Phys. B **661**, 62 (2003), hep-ph/0302272.

[9] T. Fukuyama, A. Ilakovac, T. Kikuchi, S. Meljanac and N. Okada, JHEP **0409**, 052 (2004), hep-ph/0406068; B. Dutta, Y. Mimura and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 091804 (2005), hep-ph/0412105.

[10] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. B **557**, 79 (1999), hep-th/9810155.

[11] G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9812**, 027 (1998), hep-ph/9810442.

[12] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **212**, 413 (1983).

[13] T. Kugo and S. Uehara, Nucl. Phys. B **226**, 49 (1983); S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, T. Kugo and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **223**, 191 (1983).

[14] M. A. Luty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 141801 (2002), hep-th/0205077; M. A. Luty and N. Okada, JHEP **0304**, 050 (2003), hep-th/0209178.

[15] A. Pomarol and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9905**, 013 (1999), hep-ph/9903448.

[16] See, for example, J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B **402**, 46 (1993), hep-ph/9207279, on which our notation is based.

[17] N. Sakai, Phys. Lett. B **121**, 130 (1983).

[18] See, for example, S. Abel, S. Khalil and O. Lebedev, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 151 (2001), hep-ph/0103320, and references therein.

[19] I. Jack and D. R. Jones, Phys. Lett. B **482**, 167 (2000), hep-ph/0003081; N. Kitazawa, N. Maru and N. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 015005 (2001), hep-ph/0007253; N. Arkani-Hamed, D. E. Kaplan, H. Murayama and Y. Nomura, JHEP **0102**, 041 (2001), hep-ph/0012103.

[20] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 046005 (2003), hep-th/0301240; K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, JHEP **0411**, 076 (2004), hep-th/0411066; K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, Nucl. Phys. B **718**, 113 (2005), hep-th/0503216; M. Endo, M. Yamaguchi and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 015004 (2005), hep-ph/0504036; K. Choi, K. S. Jeong and K. i. Okumura, JHEP **0509**, 039 (2005), hep-ph/0504037; A. Falkowski, O. Lebedev and Y. Mambrini, JHEP **0511**, 034 (2005), hep-ph/0507110.

[21] Z. Chacko, M. A. Luty, I. Maksymyk and E. Ponton, JHEP **0004**, 001 (2000), hep-ph/9905390; E. Katz, Y. Shadmi and Y. Shirman, JHEP **9908**, 015 (1999), hep-ph/9906296; B. C. Allanach and A. Dedes, JHEP **0006**, 017 (2000), hep-ph/0003222; D. E. Kaplan and G. D. Kribs, JHEP **0009**, 048 (2000), hep-ph/0009195; Z. Chacko and M. A. Luty, JHEP **0205**, 047 (2002), hep-ph/0112172; Z. Chacko and E. Ponton, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 095004 (2002), hep-ph/0112190; N. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 115009 (2002), hep-ph/0202219; A. E. Nelson and N. T. Weiner, hep-ph/0210288. O. C. Anoka, K. S. Babu and I. Gogoladze, Nucl. Phys. B **686**, 135 (2004), hep-ph/0312176.

[22] T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the workshop on the Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe, edited by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, Tsukuba, 1979); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, edited by D. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).